



GARY R. HERBERT  
Governor

SPENCER J. COX  
Lieutenant Governor

# State of Utah

## DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

MICHAEL R. STYLER  
Executive Director

### Division of Oil, Gas and Mining

JOHN R. BAZA  
Division Director

S/049/0036  
April  
cc: Vickie S.  
Sheri S.

March 19, 2015

### CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT 70140150000011942821

John Hewitt  
Interstate Brick Company  
9780 South 5200 West  
West Jordan, UT 84088

Subject: Proposed Assessment for State Cessation Order No. MN-2015-60-01, Interstate Brick Company, Manning Canyon Mine, S/049/0036, Utah County, Utah

### Response Due By: 30 Days of Receipt

Dear Mr. Hewitt:

The undersigned has been appointed by the Division of Oil, Gas & Mining as the assessment officer for assessing penalties under R647-7.

Enclosed is the proposed civil penalty assessment for the above referenced cessation order. The cessation was issued by Division inspector, April Abate, on February 2, 2015. Rule R647-7-103 et. seq. has been utilized to determine the proposed penalty of \$88.00. The enclosed worksheet outlines how the civil penalty was assessed.

By these rules, any written information which was submitted by you or your agent within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this Cessation Order has been considered in determining the facts surrounding the violation and the amount of this penalty.

Under R647-7-106, there are two informal appeal options available to you. You may appeal the 'fact of the violation', the proposed civil penalty, or both. If you wish to informally appeal you should file a written request for an informal conference within thirty 30 days of receipt of this letter.

The informal conference will be conducted by a Division-appointed conference officer. The informal conference for the fact of the violation is distinct from the informal assessment conference regarding the proposed penalty. If you wish to review both the fact of the violation and proposed penalty assessment, you should file a written request for an assessment conference within thirty (30) days of






receipt of this letter. In this case, the assessment conference will be scheduled immediately following the review of the fact of the violation.

**If a timely request for review is not made, the fact of the violation will stand, the proposed penalty will become final, and will be due and payable within thirty (30) days of the date of this proposed assessment (by April 20, 2015). Please remit payment to the Division, mail c/o Sheri Sasaki.**

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Lynn Kunzler', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Lynn Kunzler  
Assessment Officer

LK:eb

Enclosure: Proposed assessment worksheet

cc: Sheri Sasaki, Accounting

Vickie Southwick, Exec. Sec.

O:\M049-Utah\S0490036-ManningCyn\non-compliance\pass-6450-03192015.doc



**WORKSHEET FOR ASSESSMENT OF PENALTIES**  
**DIVISION OF OIL, GAS & MINING**  
**Minerals Regulatory Program**

NOV / CO #: MC-2015-60-01 PERMIT: S/049/0036  
COMPANY / MINE Interstate Brick Company / Manning Canyon Mine  
ASSESSMENT DATE March 19, 2015  
ASSESSMENT OFFICER Lynn Kunzler

**I. HISTORY (Max. 25 pts.) (R647-7-103.2.11)**

- A. Are there previous violations, which are not pending or vacated, which fall three (3) years of today's date?

PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS	EFFECTIVE DATE	POINTS (1pt for NOV 5pts for CO)
<u>None</u>	<u></u>	<u></u>

**TOTAL HISTORY POINTS 0**

**II. SERIOUSNESS (Max 45pts) (R647-7-103.2.12)**

NOTE: For assignment of points in Parts II and III, the following apply:

1. Based on facts supplied by the inspector, the Assessment Officer will determine within each category where the violation falls.
2. Beginning at the mid-point of the category, the Assessment Officer will adjust the points up or down, utilizing the inspector=s and operator=s statements as guiding documents.

Is this an EVENT (A) or Administrative (B) violation? Event (A)  
(assign points according to A or B)

**A. EVENT VIOLATIONS (Max 45 pts.)**

1. What is the event which the violated standard was designed to prevent?  
Reduced Reclamation Potential/Environmental Harm
2. What is the probability of the occurrence of the event which a violated standard was designed to prevent?

<u>PROBABILITY</u>	<u>POINT RANGE</u>
None	0
Unlikely	1-9
Likely	10-19
Occurred	20

**ASSIGN PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE POINTS 5**

**PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:**

Points assigned at mid point of the unlikely range – for this event to occur, the company would have to walk away from the mine and leave the reclamation for the State to do with the forfeited surety – which is large enough for most of the work to be completed.



3. What is the extent of actual or potential damage: \_\_\_\_

**ASSIGN DAMAGE POINTS( RANGE 0-25) 1**

In assigning points, consider the duration and extent of said damage or impact, in terms of area and impact on the public or environment.

**PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:** Potential damage would result if the entire site was not able to be reclaimed with the current bond. The amount held was due for escalation which would only be less than 2% for the first year. Points therefore assigned at the low end of the range.

**B. ADMINISTRATIVE VIOLATIONS (Max 25pts)**

1. Is this a POTENTIAL or ACTUAL hindrance to enforcement? \_\_\_\_  
Assign points based on the extent to which enforcement is actually or potentially hindered by the violation.

**ASSIGN HINDRANCE POINTS** \_\_\_\_

**PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:** \_\_\_\_

**TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS (A or B) 6**

**III. DEGREE OF FAULT (Max 30 pts.) (R647-7-103.2.13)**

<b>A. IF SO--NO NEGLIGENCE; or, , IF SO--GREATER DEGREE OF FAULT THAN NEGLIGENCE.</b>	<b>Point Range</b>
No Negligence (Was this an inadvertent violation which was unavoidable by the exercise of reasonable care?)	0
Negligence (was this a failure of a permittee to prevent the occurrence of a violation due to indifference lack of diligence, or lack of reasonable care?)	1-15
Greater Degree of Fault (was this a failure to abate any violation or was economic gain realized by the permittee?)	16-30

**STATE DEGREE OF NEGLIGENCE** Neglegent

**ASSIGN NEGLIGENCE POINTS 8**

**PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:** The operator demonstrated negligence by not responding to written requests to increase the surety. Pionts assigned at the mid-point of the negligent range.



**IV. GOOD FAITH (Max 20 pts.) (R467-7-103.2.14)**

(Either A or B) (Does not apply to violations requiring no abatement measures, or violations not abated at the time of assessment)

**Has Violation Been Abated? Yes / No**

- A. **EASY ABATEMENT** (The operator had onsite, the resources necessary to achieve compliance of the violated standard within the permit area.)

	<u>Point Range</u>
Immediate Compliance (Immediately following the issuance of the NOV)	-11 to -20
Rapid Compliance (Permittee used diligence to abate the violation. Violation abated in less time than allotted.)	-1 to -10
Normal Compliance (Operator complied within the abatement period required, or, Operator requested an extension to abatement time)	0

- B. **DIFFICULT ABATEMENT** (The operator did not have the resources at hand to achieve compliance, or the submission of plans was required prior to physical activity to achieve compliance.)

	<u>Point Range</u>
Rapid Compliance (Permittee used diligence to abate the violation. Violation abated in less time than allotted.)	-11 to -20
Normal Compliance (Operator complied within the abatement period)	-1 to -10
Extended Compliance (Operator complied within the abatement period required, or, Operator requested an extension to abatement time) (Permittee took minimal actions for abatement to stay within the limits of the violation, or the plan submitted for abatement was incomplete.)	0

EASY OR DIFFICULT ABATEMENT? Easy Abatement

**ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS** -10

**PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:** Operator was able to provide the surety within less than 1/2 the time allotted. Maximum points for rapid compliance was therefore awarded.

**V. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY (R647-7-103.3)**

I.	TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	<u>0</u>
II.	TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	<u>6</u>
III.	TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	<u>8</u>
IV.	TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	<u>-10</u>
	TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS	<u>4</u>
	<b>TOTAL ASSESSED FINE</b>	<b><u>\$ 88</u></b>